

REMARKS

1. Claim 35 was improperly amended by crossing out the deleted words and underlining them at the same time. Appropriate corrections have been made.
2. We also agree with the Examiner's note that Claim 41 has to be canceled as it cannot depend on Claim 35 since Claim 35 relates to the structure of Figs. 1, 2, 5, 11, and 13 while Claim 41 relates to the structure of Fig. 12 which has different arrangement of slots. This species may be filed in a separate application. Therefore we canceled Claim 41 with subsequent claims that are subordinate to Claim 41.

CONCLUSION

For all the above reasons, the applicant submits that the specification and claims are now in proper form, and that the claims all define patentably over the prior art. Therefore, the applicants submit that this application is now in condition for allowance, which action they respectfully solicit.

Conditional Request For Constructive Assistance

Applicant has made a diligent effort to amend the claims of this application so that they define novel structure, which is also unobvious. If, for any reason, the Examiner believes that the claims of this application are not yet in full condition for allowance, applicant respectfully requests his constructive assistance and suggestions pursuant to the spirit of MPEP § 2173.02 and § 707.07(j). This will enable the undersigned to place this application in fully

allowable condition as soon as possible and without the need for further proceedings. The Examiner is authorized to make any needed minor corrections or changes.

Very respectfully,

Applicants:

Boris Kesil D.Morgulis
@ Gershenzon

Boris Kesil

1040 Di Giulio Avenue #200

Santa Clara, CA 95050

Tel. 408-747-8787